

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/769,533	MITSUOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas D. Rosen	3625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas D. Rosen. (3) _____.

(2) Thomas Jones. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 April 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Buettgenbach.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Nicholas D. Rosen
NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Jones came in to discuss the arguments he had made, and to further point out the distinctions between Buettgenbach and the claimed invention. Examiner Rosen said that he did not find these arguments altogether unreasonable, but it would be necessary to further consider them, and to update the search. There was also the question of how far limitations not explicitly set forth should be read into the claims, e.g., whether the delivery service in claim 10 had to be distinct from the product provider. Examiner Rosen said that he would update the search, and take appropriate action. Mr. Jones and Examiner Rosen also discussed the possibility of e-mailing a proposed amendment, or making changes by Examiner's Amendment. One problem was that a deadline was approaching.